arXiv:1401.4066v3 [math.SP] 15 Jun 2015

SPECTRAL ENCLOSURE AND SUPERCONVERGENCE FOR EIGENVALUES IN GAPS

JAMES HINCHCLIFFE† & MICHAEL STRAUSS‡

Abstract. We consider the problem of how to compute eigenvalues of a self-adjoint operator when a direct application of the Galerkin (finite-section) method is unreliable. The last two decades have seen the development of the so-called quadratic methods for addressing this problem. Recently a new perturbation approach has emerged, the idea being to perturb eigenvalues off the real line and, consequently, away from regions where the Galerkin method fails. We propose a simplified perturbation method which requires no á priori information and for which we provide a rigorous convergence analysis. The latter shows that, in general, our approach will significantly outperform the quadratic methods. We also present a new spectral enclosure for operators of the form $A + iB$ where A is self-adjoint, B is self-adjoint and bounded. This enables us to control, very precisely, how eigenvalues are perturbed from the real line. The main results are demonstrated with examples including magnetohydrodynamics, Schrödinger and Dirac operators.

Keywords: Spectral enclosure, eigenvalue problem, perturbation of eigenvalues, spectral pollution, Galerkin method, finite-section method, superconvergence.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 47A10, 47A55, 47A58, 47A75.

† Email: james.hinchcliffe@gmail.com.

‡ Department of Mathematics, University of Sussex, Falmer Campus, Brighton BN1 9QH, UK. Email: m.strauss@sussex.ac.uk.

1. Introduction

Computational spectral theory for operators which act on infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces has advanced significantly in recent years. For self-adjoint operators, the introduction of *quadratic* methods has enabled the approximation of those eigenvalues which are not reliably located by a direct application of the Galerkin method. The latter is due to *spectral pollution*; see examples 5.5, 6.1 and [2, 3, 7, 10, 12, 19, 23, 30]. Notable amongst these quadratic techniques are the Davies & Plum method [12], the Zimmermann & Mertins method [32], and the second order relative spectra [4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28]. For spectral approximation of arbitrary operators see, for example, [9, 13, 14, 15] and references therein.

The present manuscript is concerned with a technique for self-adjoint operators which is pollution-free and non-quadratic. The idea is to perturb eigenvalues into $\mathbb{C}^+$ and then approximate them with the Galerkin method. This idea was initially proposed for a particular class of differential operators; see [20, 21, 22]. An abstract version of this approach for bounded self-adjoint operators was formulated in [29]. The latter requires á priori information about the location of gaps in the essential spectrum. Our main aims are to remove the requirement of á priori information, to present a rigorous convergence analysis, and demonstrate the effectiveness of our method including a comparison with the quadratic methods. Along the way, we also prove new spectral enclosure results for any operator of the form $A+iB$ where

A is self-adjoint and B is bounded and self-adjoint; we note that any bounded operator can be expressed in this form. We now give a brief outline of our main results.

In Section 3, we consider the spectra of operators of the form $A+iB$. The main result is Theorem 3.6 where we give our new spectral enclosure results. We will define a region in terms of the spectra of A and B, then show that it contains the spectrum of $A+iB$. Corollary 3.8 shows that the enclosure is, in a sense, sharp.

Section 4 is primarily concerned with the perturbation of an eigenvalue, λ, of a self-adjoint operator, A. We consider $A+iP_n$ where $(P_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence of orthogonal projections. The main results are Theorem 4.5 and Theorem 4.6 where we prove extremely rapid convergence properties of the eigenspaces and eigenvalues associated to the perturbed eigenvalue.

In Section 5, we present our new perturbation method. The idea is based on applying the Galerkin method to $A+iP_n$ for a fixed $n\in\mathbb{N}$. The preceding results enable us to lift an eigenvalue, λ, off the real line, away from the essential spectrum, and extremely close to $\lambda+i$ where it can be approximated by a direct application of the Galerkin method. The main results are Theorem 5.2 and Theorem 5.3, where we prove the rapid convergence of Galerkin eigenspaces and eigenvalues.

In Section 6, we apply our method to several operators arising in magneto-hydrodynamics, non-relativistic and relativistic quantum mechanics. Most of our examples involve calculations using trial spaces belonging to the form domain and not the operator domain. In particular, we use the FEM spaces of piecewise linear trial functions. However, the quadratic methods require trial spaces from the operator domain. In our last example we use the operator domain which allows a comparison with the quadratic methods.

Let us now fix some notation. Unless stated otherwise, A will denote a semi-bounded (from below) self-adjoint operator acting on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. The quadratic form, spectrum, resolvent set, discrete spectrum, essential spectrum and spectral measure we denote by $\mathfrak{a}$, $\sigma(A)$, $\rho(A)$, $\sigma_{\mathrm{dis}}(A)$, $\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(A)$ and E, respectively. For $\Delta\subset\mathbb{R}$ we denote the range of $E(\Delta)$ by $\mathcal{L}(\Delta)$. Associated to the form $\mathfrak{a}$ is the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{a}}$ which has inner-product

$$\langle u,v\rangle_{\mathfrak{a}}:=\mathfrak{a}(u,v)-(m-1)\langle u,v\rangle\quad\forall u,v\in\mathrm{Dom}(\mathfrak{a})\quad\text{where}\quad m=\min\sigma(A)$$

and norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathfrak{a}}=\big(\mathfrak{a}(u,u)-(m-1)\langle u,u\rangle\big)^{\frac{1}{2}}=\|(A-m+1)^{\frac{1}{2}}u\|. \tag{1.1}$$

The gap or distance between two subspaces $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{N}$ of $\mathcal{H}$, is defined as

$$\hat{\delta}(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N})=\max\big[\delta(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N}),\delta(\mathcal{N},\mathcal{M})\big]\text{ where }\delta(\mathcal{M},\mathcal{N})=\sup_{u\in\mathcal{M},\|u\|=1}\mathrm{dist}(u,\mathcal{N});$$

see [18, Section IV.2.1] for further details. We shall write $\delta_{\mathfrak{a}}$ to indicate the gap between subspaces with respect to the norm (1.1).

2. Auxiliary geometric results

Throughout this section, we assume that $\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta\in\mathbb{R}$ with $-\infty<\alpha<\beta<\infty$ and $-\infty<\gamma<\delta<\infty$.

Definition 2.1. The functions $f,g:[0,1]\to\mathbb{C}$ and the region $\mathcal{U}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\gamma,\delta}$, we define as:

(1) if $\beta-\alpha\le\delta-\gamma$

$$\operatorname{Re} f(t)=\operatorname{Re} g(t)=\alpha(1-t)+\beta t,$$

$$\operatorname{Im} f(t)=\frac{\gamma+\delta}{2}-\sqrt{\left(\frac{\delta-\gamma}{2}\right)^2+\big(\operatorname{Re} f(t)-\alpha\big)\big(\operatorname{Re} f(t)-\beta\big)},$$

$$\operatorname{Im} g(t)=\frac{\gamma+\delta}{2}+\sqrt{\left(\frac{\delta-\gamma}{2}\right)^2+\big(\operatorname{Re} g(t)-\alpha\big)\big(\operatorname{Re} g(t)-\beta\big)},$$

$$\mathcal{U}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\gamma,\delta}:=\Bigg\{z\in\mathbb{C}:\ \alpha<\operatorname{Re} z<\beta,\ \text{with either}$$

$$\gamma\le\operatorname{Im} z<\operatorname{Im} f\left(\frac{\operatorname{Re} z-\alpha}{\beta-\alpha}\right)\ \text{or}\ \operatorname{Im} g\left(\frac{\operatorname{Re} z-\alpha}{\beta-\alpha}\right)<\operatorname{Im} z\le\delta\Bigg\},$$

(2) if $\beta-\alpha>\delta-\gamma$

$$\operatorname{Im} f(t)=\operatorname{Im} g(t)=(1-t)\gamma+t\delta,$$

$$\operatorname{Re} f(t)=\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}-\sqrt{\left(\frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}\right)^2+\big(\operatorname{Im} f(t)-\gamma\big)\big(\operatorname{Im} f(t)-\delta\big)},$$

$$\operatorname{Re} g(t)=\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}+\sqrt{\left(\frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}\right)^2+\big(\operatorname{Im} g(t)-\gamma\big)\big(\operatorname{Im} g(t)-\delta\big)},$$

$$\mathcal{U}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\gamma,\delta}:=\Bigg\{z\in\mathbb{C}:\ \gamma\le\operatorname{Im} z\le\delta\ \text{and}$$

$$\operatorname{Re} f\left(\frac{\operatorname{Im} z-\gamma}{\delta-\gamma}\right)<\operatorname{Re} z<\operatorname{Re} g\left(\frac{\operatorname{Im} z-\gamma}{\delta-\gamma}\right)\Bigg\}.$$

We also define

$$\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}^{\gamma,\delta}:=\big\{z\in\mathbb{C}:\exists t\in[0,1]\ \text{with}\ z=f(t)\ \text{or}\ z=g(t)\big\}.$$

The curves and regions defined in Definition 2.1 are demonstrated in Figure 1.

The assertions of the following two lemmata are immediate consequences of the above definition.

Lemma 2.2. *If $\beta-\alpha\le\delta-\gamma$, then*

$$\gamma\le\operatorname{Im} f(t)\le\frac{\gamma+\delta}{2}-\sqrt{\left(\frac{\delta-\gamma}{2}\right)^2-\left(\frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}\right)^2}\le\frac{\gamma+\delta}{2}\quad\textit{and}$$

$$\delta\ge\operatorname{Im} g(t)\ge\frac{\gamma+\delta}{2}+\sqrt{\left(\frac{\delta-\gamma}{2}\right)^2-\left(\frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}\right)^2}\ge\frac{\gamma+\delta}{2}\quad\forall t\in[0,1].$$

If $\beta-\alpha>\delta-\gamma$, then

$$\alpha\le\operatorname{Re} f(t)\le\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}-\sqrt{\left(\frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}\right)^2-\left(\frac{\delta-\gamma}{2}\right)^2}<\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\quad\textit{and}$$

$$\beta\ge\operatorname{Re} g(t)\ge\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}+\sqrt{\left(\frac{\beta-\alpha}{2}\right)^2-\left(\frac{\delta-\gamma}{2}\right)^2}>\frac{\alpha+\beta}{2}\quad\forall t\in[0,1].$$

Lemma 2.3. *If $\alpha<\operatorname{Re} z\le\beta$, $\gamma\le\operatorname{Im} z\le\delta$ and $z\notin\mathcal{U}_{\alpha,\beta}^{\gamma,\delta}\cup\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}^{\gamma,\delta}$, then*

$$\operatorname{Re} z-\frac{(\operatorname{Im} z-\delta)(\operatorname{Im} z-\gamma)}{\operatorname{Re} z-\alpha}>\beta.$$



FIGURE 1. The figures show the curves f and g (which together form $\Gamma^{\gamma,\delta}_{\alpha,\beta}$). The shaded regions are $\mathcal{U}^{\gamma,\delta}_{\alpha,\beta}$. Clockwise from top left: $\alpha = 0$, $\beta = 1$, $\gamma = -1$, $\delta = 1$; $\alpha = 0$, $\beta = 1$, $\gamma = -5/9$, $\delta = 5/9$; $\alpha = 0$, $\beta = 1$, $\gamma = -1/2$, $\delta = 1/2$; $\alpha = 0$, $\beta = 1$, $\gamma = -1/4$, $\delta = 1/4$.

If $z \in \Gamma^{\gamma,\delta}_{\alpha,\beta}$ *and* $\operatorname{Re} z \neq \alpha$, *then*

$$\operatorname{Re} z - \frac{(\operatorname{Im} z - \delta)(\operatorname{Im} z - \gamma)}{\operatorname{Re} z - \alpha} = \beta.$$

If $z \in \mathcal{U}^{\gamma,\delta}_{\alpha,\beta}$, *then*

$$\operatorname{Re} z - \frac{(\operatorname{Im} z - \delta)(\operatorname{Im} z - \gamma)}{\operatorname{Re} z - \alpha} < \beta.$$

Lemma 2.4. *If* $z \in \mathcal{U}^{\gamma,\delta}_{\alpha,\beta}$, *then*

$$\beta - \operatorname{Re} z \geq \frac{\operatorname{dist}(z, \Gamma^{\gamma,\delta}_{\alpha,\beta})^2}{\operatorname{Re} z - \alpha} - \frac{(\operatorname{Im} z - \delta)(\operatorname{Im} z - \gamma)}{\operatorname{Re} z - \alpha}.$$

Proof. Let $z \in \mathcal{U}^{\gamma,\delta}_{\alpha,\beta}$. First, consider the case where $\beta - \alpha \leq \delta - \gamma$. By Lemma 2.2, we have $\operatorname{Im} z \neq (\gamma + \delta)/2$. We assume that $\operatorname{Im} z > (\gamma + \delta)/2$, the case where $\operatorname{Im} z < (\gamma + \delta)/2$ may be treated similarly. For some $r \geq \operatorname{dist}(z, \Gamma^{\gamma,\delta}_{\alpha,\beta}) > 0$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, we have

$$\operatorname{Re} z + (\operatorname{Im} z - r)i = g(t).$$

Then, using Lemma 2.3,

$$\operatorname{Re} z - \frac{(\operatorname{Im} z - r - \delta)(\operatorname{Im} z - r - \gamma)}{\operatorname{Re} z - \alpha} = \beta$$

and hence

$$\beta - \operatorname{Re} z + \frac{(\operatorname{Im} z - \delta)(\operatorname{Im} z - \gamma)}{\operatorname{Re} z - \alpha} = -\frac{r(\gamma + \delta + r - 2\operatorname{Im} z)}{\operatorname{Re} z - \alpha} > \frac{r^2}{\operatorname{Re} z - \alpha}.$$

Now consider the case where $\beta-\alpha>\gamma+\delta$. Let $\operatorname{Re} z\geq(\alpha+\beta)/2$, the case where $\operatorname{Re} z<(\alpha+\beta)/2$ may be treated similarly. For some $r\geq\operatorname{dist}(z,\Gamma^{\gamma,\delta}_{\alpha,\beta})>0$ we have

$$\operatorname{Re} z+r-\frac{(\operatorname{Im} z-\delta)(\operatorname{Im} z-\gamma)}{\operatorname{Re} z+r-\alpha}=\beta$$

and hence

$$\beta-\operatorname{Re} z+\frac{(\operatorname{Im} z-\delta)(\operatorname{Im} z-\gamma)}{\operatorname{Re} z-\alpha}=r\left(\frac{2\operatorname{Re} z-\alpha-\beta+r}{\operatorname{Re} z-\alpha}\right)\geq\frac{r^2}{\operatorname{Re} z-\alpha}.$$

□

3. The spectra of $A+iB$

In this section we will prove enclosure results for $\sigma(A+iB)$. Unless stated otherwise, A is assumed to be a bounded self-adjoint operator with

$$\min\sigma(A)=:a^-<a^+:=\max\sigma(A).$$

We shall always assume that B is a bounded self-adjoint operator with

$$\min\sigma(B)=:b^-<b^+:=\max\sigma(B).$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let $u\in\mathcal{H}$, then $\|Bu\|^2\leq(b^-+b^+)\langle Bu,u\rangle-b^-b^+\|u\|^2$.*

Proof. Let F be the spectral measure associated to B. For all $\lambda\in[b^-,b^+]$ we have $(\lambda-b^-)(\lambda-b^+)\leq0$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}\|Bu\|^2&=\int_{b^-}^{b^+}\lambda^2\,d\langle F_\lambda u,u\rangle\leq\int_{b^-}^{b^+}(\lambda b^-+\lambda b^+-b^-b^+)\,d\langle F_\lambda u,u\rangle\\&=(b^-+b^+)\langle Bu,u\rangle-b^-b^+\|u\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

□

We will make use of the following spectral enclosure result which is due to Kato; see [16, Lemma 1]. Let $u\in\operatorname{Dom}(A)$ where A may be unbounded, $\|u\|=1$, $\langle Au,u\rangle=\eta$ and $\|(A-\eta)u\|=\zeta$, then

$$\xi<\eta\quad\Rightarrow\quad\left(\xi,\eta+\frac{\zeta^2}{\eta-\xi}\right]\cap\sigma(A)\neq\varnothing.\tag{3.1}$$

Definition 3.2. For $a,b\in\mathbb{R}$, $a<b$, we set

$$\begin{aligned}r_{a,b}&=\max\left\{\frac{b-a}{2},\|B\|\right\},\\s_{a,b}&=\Big(r_{a,b}^2+2r_{a,b}\big(4+10\|B\|\big)+4\|B\|^2\Big)(b-a),\\K_{a,b}&=\max\Big\{r_{a,b}^4,2r_{a,b}^3,s_{a,b}\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 3.3. *Let $(a,b)\subset\rho(A)$ where A may be unbounded from above and/or below. Then*

$$\mathcal{U}_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+}\subset\rho(A+iB)$$

and

$$\|(A+iB-z)^{-1}\|\leq\frac{K_{a,b}}{\operatorname{dist}(z,\Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+})^4}\quad\forall z\in\mathcal{U}_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+}.\tag{3.2}$$

Proof. Let $z\in\mathcal{U}_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+}$. First we note that $A+iB-z$ is a closed operator. Let $u\in\operatorname{Dom}(A)$ with $\|u\|=1$ and $\|(A+iB-z)u\|=\varepsilon$. Assume that

$$\varepsilon<\min\left\{1,\frac{\operatorname{dist}(z,\Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+})}{2}\right\}.\tag{3.3}$$

Let us show that (3.3) implies that $a < \mathrm{Re}\ z - \varepsilon$. We consider the case where $b - a > b^+ - b^-$ (the case where $b - a \leq b^+ - b^-$ may be treated similarly). We have

$$\mathrm{Im}\ z = (1-t)b^- + tb^+ \quad \text{for some } t \in [0,1].$$

Then

$$\mathrm{Re}\ f\left(\frac{\mathrm{Im}\ z - b^-}{b^+ - b^-}\right) + i\mathrm{Im}\ z = f\left(\frac{\mathrm{Im}\ z - b^-}{b^+ - b^-}\right) \in \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon < \mathrm{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+}) &\leq \left| z - f\left(\frac{\mathrm{Im}\ z - b^-}{b^+ - b^-}\right)\right| \\ &= \mathrm{Re}\ z - \mathrm{Re}\ f\left(\frac{\mathrm{Im}\ z - b^-}{b^+ - b^-}\right) \\ &\leq \mathrm{Re}\ z - a.\end{aligned}$$

For some $v \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|v\| = 1$ we have $(A + iB - z)u = \varepsilon v$, therefore

$$\langle (A - \mathrm{Re}\ z)u, u\rangle + i\langle (B - \mathrm{Im}\ z)u, u\rangle = \varepsilon\langle v, u\rangle$$

and

$$a < \mathrm{Re}\ z - \varepsilon \leq \langle Au, u\rangle \leq \mathrm{Re}\ z + \varepsilon, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\langle Bu, u\rangle = \mathrm{Im}\ z + \varepsilon \mathrm{Im}\ \langle v, u\rangle, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\|(A - \mathrm{Re}\ z)u\| \leq \varepsilon + \|(B - \mathrm{Im}\ z)u\|. \tag{3.6}$$

Using Lemma 3.1 and (3.5), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|(B - \mathrm{Im}\ z)u\|^2 &= \|Bu\|^2 - 2\mathrm{Im}\ z\langle Bu, u\rangle + (\mathrm{Im}\ z)^2 \\ &\leq \langle Bu, u\rangle(b^- + b^+) - b^-b^+ - 2\mathrm{Im}\ z\langle Bu, u\rangle + (\mathrm{Im}\ z)^2 \\ &= -(\mathrm{Im}\ z - b^+)(\mathrm{Im}\ z - b^-) + \varepsilon \mathrm{Im}\ \langle v, u\rangle(b^+ + b^- - 2\mathrm{Im}\ z).\end{aligned}$$

Now applying (3.1) with

$$\xi = a, \quad \eta = \langle Au, u\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta = \|(A - \eta)u\| \leq \|(A - \mathrm{Re}\ z)u\| + |\mathrm{Re}\ z - \eta|,$$

we obtain

$$\left(a, \langle Au, u\rangle + \frac{(\|(A - \mathrm{Re}\ z)u\| + |\mathrm{Re}\ z - \eta|)^2}{\langle Au, u\rangle - a}\right] \cap \sigma(A) \neq \varnothing.$$

Using (3.4) and (3.6), we have

$$\left(a, \mathrm{Re}\ z + \varepsilon + \frac{\big(2\varepsilon + \|(B - \mathrm{Im}\ z)u\|\big)^2}{\mathrm{Re}\ z - \varepsilon - a}\right] \cap \sigma(A) \neq \varnothing.$$

Then, using $(a, b) \subset \rho(A)$ and $|\mathrm{Im}\ z| \leq \|B\|$, and the assumption that $\varepsilon < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}b - \mathrm{Re}\ z &\leq \varepsilon + \frac{4\varepsilon^2 + 4\varepsilon\|(B - \mathrm{Im}\ z)u\| + \|(B - \mathrm{Im}\ z)u\|^2}{\mathrm{Re}\ z - \varepsilon - a} \\ &\leq \varepsilon + \frac{4\varepsilon + 8\|B\|\varepsilon}{\mathrm{Re}\ z - a - \varepsilon} - \frac{(\mathrm{Im}\ z - b^+)(\mathrm{Im}\ z - b^-)}{\mathrm{Re}\ z - \varepsilon - a} \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon|b^+ + b^- - 2\mathrm{Im}\ z|}{\mathrm{Re}\ z - a - \varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

Combining this estimate with Lemma 2.4

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+})^2}{\mathrm{Re}\ z - a} &\leq \varepsilon + \frac{4\varepsilon + 8\|B\|\varepsilon}{\mathrm{Re}\ z - a - \varepsilon} - \frac{\varepsilon(\mathrm{Im}\ z - b^+)(\mathrm{Im}\ z - b^-)}{(\mathrm{Re}\ z - a)(\mathrm{Re}\ z - a - \varepsilon)} \\ &\quad + \frac{\varepsilon(b^+ - b^-)}{\mathrm{Re}\ z - a - \varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

From (3.3) we deduce that

$$\operatorname{Re} z - a - \varepsilon \geq \operatorname{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+}) - \varepsilon > \frac{\operatorname{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+})}{2}$$

and hence

$$\frac{\operatorname{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+})^2}{\operatorname{Re} z - a} \leq \left(1 + 2\frac{4 + 10\|B\|}{\operatorname{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+})} + \frac{4\|B\|^2}{\operatorname{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+})^2}\right)\varepsilon.$$

Then

$$\operatorname{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+})^4 \leq \Big(r_{a,b}^2 + 2r_{a,b}\big(4 + 10\|B\|\big) + 4\|B\|^2\Big)(b-a)\varepsilon$$

and therefore

$$\operatorname{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+})^4 \big/ s_{a,b} \leq \varepsilon. \tag{3.7}$$

It follows from (3.7) and assumption (3.3), that $\operatorname{nul}(A + iB - z) = 0$ and that $A+iB-z$ has closed range. Similarly, $\operatorname{nul}(A-iB-\overline{z}) = 0$ and $A-iB-\overline{z}$ has closed range. Since $\operatorname{def}(A+iB-z) = \operatorname{nul}(A-iB-\overline{z})$ we deduce that $z \in \rho(A+iB-z)$. Furthermore, combining (3.7) with assumption (3.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|(A + iB - z)^{-1}\| &\leq \frac{\max\left\{s_{a,b}, \operatorname{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+})^4, 2\operatorname{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+})^3\right\}}{\operatorname{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+})^4} \\ &\leq \frac{K_{a,b}}{\operatorname{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+})^4}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3.4. Suppose that $a_1 < b_1 \leq a_2 < b_2$,

$$(a_1, b_1) \subset \rho(A), \quad (a_2, b_2) \subset \rho(A) \quad \text{and} \quad \min\{b_1 - a_1, b_2 - a_2\} > b^+ - b^-.$$

Let f_1, g_1 be as in Definition 2.1 with $\alpha = a_1$, $\beta = b_1$, $\gamma = \beta^-$ and $\delta = \beta^+$. Let f_2, g_2 be as in Definition 2.1 with $\alpha = a_2$, $\beta = b_2$, $\gamma = \beta^-$ and $\delta = \beta^+$. The curves g_1 and f_2 enclose a region (see Figure 2). It follows, from Theorem 3.3, that the dimension of the spectral subspace associated to $\sigma(A+iB)$ and this enclosed region is the same as the dimension of the spectral subspace associated to $\sigma(A)$ and the interval $[b_1, a_2]$.



FIGURE 2. The figures show g_1, f_2 and the shaded region they enclose; on the left $a_1 = 0$, $b_1 = 4$, $a_2 = 5$, $b_2 = 10$ $b^- = -1$ and $b^+ = 2$; on the right $a_1 = 0$, $b_1 = 4$, $a_2 = 4$, $b_2 = 7.1$, $b^- = -1$ and $b^+ = 2$.

Definition 3.5. We denote the numerical range by $W(\cdot)$, and define

$$\mathcal{U}_A := \bigcup_{\substack{a,b\in W(A)\\(a,b)\subset\rho(A)}} \mathcal{U}_{a,b}^{b^-,b^+},$$

$$\mathcal{X}_A := \left\{z\in\mathbb{C}:\ \mathrm{Re}\, z\in\overline{W(A)}\ \text{ and }\ b^-\le \mathrm{Im}\, z\le b^+\right\}\Big\backslash \mathcal{U}_A,$$

$$\mathcal{V}_B := \left\{z\in\mathbb{C}:\mathrm{Im}\, z + i\mathrm{Re}\, z\in\hat{\mathcal{V}}_B\right\}\quad\text{where}\quad \hat{\mathcal{V}}_B := \bigcup_{\substack{a,b\in W(B)\\(a,b)\subset\rho(B)}} \mathcal{U}_{a,b}^{a^-,a^+},$$

$$\mathcal{Y}_B := \left\{z\in\mathbb{C}:\mathrm{Im}\, z\in\overline{W(B)}\ \text{ and }\ a^-\le \mathrm{Re}\, z\le a^+\right\}\Big\backslash \mathcal{V}_B.$$

Theorem 3.6. *If A is unbounded from above and/or below, then*

$$\sigma(A+iB)\subset\mathcal{X}_A. \tag{3.8}$$

If A is bounded, then

$$\sigma(A+iB)\subset\mathcal{X}_A\cap\mathcal{Y}_B. \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. The first assertion follows immediately from Theorem 3.3. Suppose that A is bounded. Then $\sigma(A+iB)\subset\mathcal{X}_A$ again follows from Theorem 3.3. Let $w\notin\mathcal{Y}_B$. Then either

$$w\notin\left\{z\in\mathbb{C}:\mathrm{Im}\, z\in\overline{W(B)}\ \text{ and }\ a^-\le\mathrm{Re}\, z\le a^+\right\}\quad\text{or}\quad w\in\mathcal{V}_B.$$

Suppose the former is true, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Im}\, w + i\mathrm{Re}\, w\in\rho(B+iA)\quad&\Rightarrow\quad \mathrm{Im}\, w - i\mathrm{Re}\, w\in\rho(B-iA)\\&\Rightarrow\quad \mathrm{Re}\, w + i\mathrm{Im}\, w\in\rho(A+iB).\end{aligned}$$

Suppose instead that $w\in\mathcal{V}_B$, then for some $a,b\in W(B)$, $(a,b)\subset\rho(B)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Im}\, w + i\mathrm{Re}\, w\in\mathcal{U}_{a,b}^{a^-,a^+}\quad&\Rightarrow\quad \mathrm{Im}\, w + i\mathrm{Re}\, w\in\rho(B+iA)\\&\Rightarrow\quad \mathrm{Re}\, w + i\mathrm{Im}\, w\in\rho(A+iB).\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3.7. Any bounded linear operator, $T\in\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, may be expressed as

$$T=\underbrace{\left(\frac{T+T^*}{2}\right)}_{A}+i\underbrace{\left(\frac{T-T^*}{2i}\right)}_{B}$$

where A and B are bounded self-adjoint operators. Hence, Theorem 3.6 provides an enclosure for the spectrum, in terms of the real and imaginary parts, of any bounded linear operator.

Corollary 3.8. *Let $\sigma(A)=\{a^-,a^+\}$ and $\sigma(B)=\{b^-,b^+\}$, then $\sigma(A+iB)\subset\Gamma_{a^-,a^+}^{b^-,b^+}$. For any $z\in\Gamma_{a^-,a^+}^{b^-,b^+}$, B may be chosen such that $z\in\sigma(A+iB)$.*

Proof. The first assertion follows immediately from theorems 3.3 and 3.6. Let u,v be normalised eigenvectors with $Au=a^-u$ and $Av=a^+v$. For $t\in[0,1]$ we define the family of self-adjoint operators

$$\begin{aligned}B(t)x = b^-\langle x,\sqrt{1-t}u+\sqrt{t}v\rangle(\sqrt{1-t}u+\sqrt{t}v)\\+b^+\langle x,\sqrt{t}u-\sqrt{1-t}v\rangle(\sqrt{t}u-\sqrt{1-t}v).\end{aligned}$$

Evidently,

$$\min\sigma(B(t))=b^-\quad\text{and}\quad\max\sigma(B(t))=b^+\quad\forall t\in[0,1].$$

Furthermore,

$$Au + iB(0)u = (a^- + ib^-)u, \quad Av + iB(0)v = (a^+ + ib^+)v,$$
$$Au + iB(1)u = (a^- + ib^+)u, \quad Av + iB(1)v = (a^+ + ib^-)v.$$

Hence, for each $z \in \Gamma_{a^-,a^+}^{b^-,b^+}$ there exists a $t \in [0,1]$ for which $z \in \sigma(A + iB(t))$. □

Example 3.9. Let $\sigma(A) = \{-1, 0, 2\}$ and $\sigma(B) = \{-s, 0, s\}$ where $s \in \mathbb{R}$. By Theorem 3.6 we have $\sigma(A+iB) \subset \mathcal{X}_A \cap \mathcal{Y}_B$. For varying values of $s \in \mathbb{R}$, Figures 3–5 show the region(s) enclosed by $\mathcal{X}_A \cap \mathcal{Y}_B$. Also shown is $\sigma(A+iB)$ for 1000 randomly generated 3×3 matrices A and B where $\sigma(A) = \{-1, 0, 2\}$ and $\sigma(B) = \{-s, 0, s\}$.



FIGURE 3. With $s = 0.25$, $\mathcal{X}_A \cap \mathcal{Y}_B$ consists of 3 disjoint regions which are shown top left. Also shown are the three regions in more detail. The red dots are $\sigma(A + iB)$ for 1000 randomly generated 3×3 matrices A and B where $\sigma(A) = \{-1, 0, 2\}$ and $\sigma(B) = \{-s, 0, s\}$.

4. PERTURBATION OF $\sigma_{\text{dis}}(A)$

In this section we consider $\sigma(A + iP)$ where P is a non-trivial orthogonal projection. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a, b \in \rho(A)$, $a < b$ and denote $\Delta = [a, b]$. For the remainder of this manuscript, we assume that

$$\sigma(A) \cap \Delta = \{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d\} \subset \sigma_{\text{dis}}(A) \quad \text{where} \quad d < \infty.$$

We are concerned with the perturbation of the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d\}$. By theorems 3.3 and 3.6, we have

$$\mathcal{U}_{a,\lambda_1}^{0,1} \cup \mathcal{U}_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}^{0,1} \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{U}_{\lambda_{d-1},\lambda_d}^{0,1} \cup \mathcal{U}_{\lambda_d,b}^{0,1} \subset \rho(A + iP) \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(A + iP) \subset \mathcal{X}_A.$$

However, we shall be interested in the set

$$\mathcal{U}_{a,b}^{0,1} \cap \sigma(A + iP). \tag{4.1}$$



FIGURE 4. With $s = 0.5$, the region $\mathcal{X}_A \cap \mathcal{Y}_B$ now consists of 2 disjoint regions; the first two regions on the top left of Figure 3 have merged into one. The red dots are $\sigma(A + iB)$ for 1000 randomly generated 3×3 matrices A and B where $\sigma(A) = \{-1, 0, 2\}$ and $\sigma(B) = \{-s, 0, s\}$.



FIGURE 5. Clockwise from top left $s = 1, 1.25, 4, 3$. The red dots are $\sigma(A + iB)$ for 1000 randomly generated 3×3 matrices A and B where $\sigma(A) = \{-1, 0, 2\}$ and $\sigma(B) = \{-s, 0, s\}$.

We will show that when $\|(I - P)E(\Delta)\|$ is sufficiently small, then (4.1) will consist only of elements in a small neighbourhood of $\Gamma^{0,1}_{a,b}$, and of eigenvalues which are in small neighbourhoods of the $\lambda_j + i$, $1 \leq j \leq d$.

Definition 4.1. For $z \in \mathcal{U}^{0,1}_{a,b}$, and $K_{a,b}$ as in Definition 3.2 (with $b^- = 0$ and $b^+ = 1$), we set

$$d(z) = \min \left\{ \frac{\operatorname{dist}\left(z, \Gamma^{0,1}_{a,b}\right)^4}{K_{a,b}}, \operatorname{dist}\left(z, \{\lambda_1 + i, \ldots, \lambda_d + i\}\right) \right\}.$$

Proposition 4.2. *Let $z \in \mathcal{U}_{a,b}^{0,1}$ and $d(z) > 3\|(I-P)E(\Delta)\|$, then*

$$z \in \rho(A+iP) \quad \text{and} \quad \|(A+iP-z)^{-1}\| \le \Big(d(z) - 3\|(I-P)E(\Delta)\|\Big)^{-1}. \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. For simplicity let us denote $E = E(\Delta)$ and $\varepsilon = \|(I-P)E(\Delta)\|$. We readily deduce that $\|(I-E)PE\| \le \varepsilon$ and $\|EP(I-E)\| \le \varepsilon$. With these inequalities and the identity $P = EPE + (I-E)PE + EP(I-E) + (I-E)P(I-E)$, we obtain for any $u \in \mathrm{Dom}(A)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(A+iP-z)u\| &= \|(A-z)(I-E)u + (A-z)Eu + iPu\| \\
&= \|(A-z)(I-E)u + (A-z)Eu \\
&\quad + i\big(EPE + (I-E)PE \\
&\quad + EP(I-E) + (I-E)P(I-E)\big)u\| \\
&\ge \|(A-z)(I-E)u + i(I-E)P(I-E)u \\
&\quad + (A-z)Eu + iEPEu\| \\
&\quad - \|(I-E)PEu + EP(I-E)u\| \\
&\ge \|(A-z)(I-E)u + i(I-E)P(I-E)u \\
&\quad + (A-z)Eu + iEPEu\| - 2\varepsilon\|u\|.
\end{aligned}$$

The term $(A-z)Eu + iEPEu$ satisfies the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(A-z)Eu + iEPEu\| &= \|(A-z+i)Eu + iE(P-I)Eu\| \\
&\ge (d(z) - \varepsilon)\|Eu\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Next consider the term $(A-z)(I-E)u + i(I-E)P(I-E)u$. We have

$$(A-z)(I-E) + i(I-E)P(I-E) : \mathcal{H} \ominus \mathcal{L}(\Delta) \to \mathcal{H} \ominus \mathcal{L}(\Delta).$$

The restriction of A to $\mathcal{H} \ominus \mathcal{L}(\Delta)$ is a self-adjoint operator with no spectrum in the interval Δ. The restriction of $(I-E)P$ to $\mathcal{H} \ominus \mathcal{L}(\Delta)$ is a self-adjoint operator with $0 \le (I-E)P \le 1$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(A-z)(I-E)u + i(I-E)P(I-E)u\| &\ge \frac{\mathrm{dist}(z, \Gamma_{a,b}^{0,1})^4}{K_{a,b}} \|(I-E)u\| \\
&\ge d(z)\|(I-E)u\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining these three estimates yields the result. □

Lemma 4.3. *Let $(I-P)E(\Delta) = 0$. Then*

$$\mathcal{U}_{a,b}^{0,1} \Big\backslash \{\lambda_1 + i, \dots, \lambda_d + i\} \subset \rho(A+iP).$$

Moreover, $\lambda_j + i$ is an eigenvalue of $A+iP$ with spectral subspace $\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda_j\})$, and $A + iP - (\lambda_j + i)$ is Fredholm with index zero.

Proof. The first assertion follows immediately from Proposition 4.2. Let $\lambda \in \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d\}$. Whenever $u \in \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$ we have $(A+iP)u = (\lambda + i)u$. Further, if $v \in \mathrm{Dom}(A)$ and $(A+iP)v = (\lambda+i)v$, then $(A-\lambda)v = i(I-P)v$ and therefore

$$\langle (A-\lambda)v, v\rangle = i\langle (I-P)v, v\rangle = i\|(I-P)v\|^2.$$

It follows that $(I-P)v = 0$ and $(A-\lambda)v = 0$, and hence $v \in \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$. We deduce that $\mathrm{nul}(A + iP - (\lambda+i)) = \mathrm{nul}(A-\lambda)$ where $\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$ is the null space for both operators. Suppose that $\lambda + i$ is not semi-simple. Then there exists a non-zero vector $w \perp \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$ with $(A + iP - \lambda - i)w = u \in \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$. Hence,

$$(A - \lambda - i)w \perp \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\}) \quad \text{with} \quad \|(A-\lambda-i)w\| > \|w\|,$$

and

$$iPw = u - (A - \lambda - i)w \quad \text{where} \quad u \perp (A - \lambda - i)w.$$

It follows that

$$\|Pw\|^2 = \|u\|^2 + \|(A - \lambda - i)w\|^2 > \|w\|^2,$$

which is a contradiction since $\|P\| = 1$.

Next we show that $A + iP - (\lambda + i)$ is Fredholm. The operator $A + iP - (\lambda + i)$ has closed range iff there exists a $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\|(A + iP - (\lambda + i))v\| \geq \gamma \text{dist}(v, \mathcal{L}\{\lambda\}) \quad \forall v \in \text{Dom}(A); \tag{4.3}$$

see [18, Theorem IV.5.2]. We suppose that (4.3) is false. There exist $0 \leq \gamma_n \to 0$ and $v_n \in \text{Dom}(A)$ with

$$\|(A + iP - (\lambda + i))v_n\| < \gamma_n \text{dist}(v_n, \mathcal{L}\{\lambda\}), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Set $\tilde{w}_n = (I - E(\{\lambda\})v_n$, note $\tilde{w}_n \neq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and denote $w_n = \tilde{w}_n / \|\tilde{w}_n\|$. Using $(I - P)E(\{\lambda\}) = 0$, we have

$$\gamma_n = \frac{\gamma_n \text{dist}(v_n, \mathcal{L}\{\lambda\})}{\|\tilde{w}_n\|} > \frac{\|(A + iP - (\lambda + i))v_n\|}{\|\tilde{w}_n\|} = \|(A + iP - (\lambda + i))w_n\|,$$

and hence $(A - \lambda)w_n - i(I - P)w_n \to 0$. Since

$$\langle (A - \lambda)w_n, w_n \rangle \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle i(I - P)w_n, w_n \rangle = i\|(I - P)w_n\|^2,$$

we deduce that $(I - P)w_n \to 0$ and therefore also that $(A - \lambda)w_n \to 0$. The latter implies that $\text{dist}(w_n, \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})) \to 0$ which is a contradiction since $w_n \perp \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$ and $\|w_n\| = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. From the contradiction we deduce that $A + iP - (\lambda + i)$ has closed range. Furthermore,

$$\Big(A + iP - (\lambda + i)\Big)^* = A - iP - (\lambda - i)$$

and arguing as above we deduce that 0 is an eigenvalue of $A - iP - (\lambda - i)$ with null space $\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$. Hence

$$\text{def}(A + iP - (\lambda + i)) = \text{nul}(A - iP - (\lambda - i)) = \text{nul}(A + iP - (\lambda + i));$$

see [18, Theorem IV.5.13]. Thus $A + iP - (\lambda + i)$ is Fredholm and the result follows. □

We fix a $\lambda \in \{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d\}$ with $\dim \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\}) = \kappa$, and an $0 < r < 1/2$ with

$$\mathbb{D}(\lambda + i, 2r) \cap \big(\sigma(A) + i\big) = \{\lambda + i\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{D}(\lambda + i, 2r) \cap \Gamma_{a,b}^{0,1} = \varnothing. \tag{4.4}$$

where $\mathbb{D}(x, y)$ is the closed disc with centre x and radius y.

Lemma 4.4. *If $\|(I - P)E(\Delta)\|$ is sufficiently small, then*

$$\mathbb{D}(\lambda + i, r) \cap \sigma(A + iP) \neq \varnothing$$

and the dimension of the corresponding spectral subspace is equal to κ.

Proof. Let $u_1, \ldots, u_\kappa$ be an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$. Set $v_j = Pu_j$ and let $v_{\kappa+1}, v_{\kappa+2}, \ldots$ be such that

$$\text{Range}(P) = \text{span}\{v_1, \ldots, v_\kappa, v_{\kappa+1}, v_{\kappa+2}, \ldots\}.$$

For $t \in [0, 1]$ set $w_j(t) = tu_j + (1-t)v_j$ and let P_t be the orthogonal projection onto $\text{span}\{w_1(t), \ldots, w_\kappa(t), v_{\kappa+1}, v_{\kappa+2}, \ldots\}$. For any normalised $u \in \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$ we have $u = c_1u_1 + \cdots + c_ku_\kappa$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\|(I - P_t)u\| &\leq \|c_1u_1 + \cdots + c_\kappa u_\kappa - c_1w_1(t) - \cdots - c_\kappa w_\kappa(t)\| \\ &= (1 - t)\|(1 - P)u\|.\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\|(I - P_t)E(\Delta)\| \leq (1 - t)\|(I - P)E(\Delta)\| \quad \forall t \in [0, 1]. \tag{4.5}$$

By Lemma 4.3, we have $\lambda + i \in \sigma(A + iP_1)$ with spectral subspace $\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$. By Proposition 4.2 and (4.5) we deduce that whenever $\|(I - P)E(\Delta)\|$ is sufficiently small, the operator $A + iP_t - zI$ is invertible with uniformly bounded inverse for all $|z-\lambda-i| = r$ and $t \in [0, 1]$. Hence, we may define the family of spectral projections

$$Q_t := \int_{|\lambda+i-z|=r} (A + iP_t - \zeta)^{-1}\, d\zeta.$$

Evidently, $Q(t)$ is a continuous family and therefore

$$\kappa = \dim\big(\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})\big) = \mathrm{Rank}(Q_1) = \mathrm{Rank}(Q_t) \quad \forall t \in [0, 1].$$

□

In view of Lemma 4.4, it is natural to consider operators of the form $A + iP_n$ where (P_n) is as sequence of orthogonal projections which converge strongly to the identity operator. The range of P_n is denoted $\mathcal{L}_n$. It follows from Proposition 4.2 and Lemma 4.4 that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sigma(A + iP_n) \cap \mathcal{U}_{a,b}^{0,1} = \big\{\lambda_1 + i, \ldots, \lambda_d + i\big\}. \tag{4.6}$$

We prove below, in Theorem 4.6, that elements from $\sigma(A + iP_n)$ converge to $\lambda + i$ extremely rapidly. To this end, we denote by $\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda + i\})$ the spectral subspace which corresponds to $\sigma(A + iP_n) \cap \mathbb{D}(\lambda + i, r)$. We also set $\varepsilon_n = \delta(\mathcal{L}(\Delta), \mathcal{L}_n)$.

Theorem 4.5. *There exists a constant $c_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\}), \mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda + i\})\big) \le c_0\varepsilon_n \quad \textit{for all sufficiently large } n.$$

Proof. For simplicity, let us denote $E = E(\Delta)$. Note that

$$\sigma(A + iE) = \big\{\sigma(A)\backslash\{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d\}\big\} \cup \{\lambda_1 + i, \ldots, \lambda_d + i\}$$

and the spectral subspace associated to $\lambda + i$ is $\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$. With r as in (4.4), we have for any $|\lambda + i - z| = r$,

$$z \in \rho(A + iE) \quad \text{with} \quad \|(A + iE - z)^{-1}\| = \frac{1}{r}.$$

It follows easily from Proposition 4.2 that there exists a $c_1 > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $n \ge N$ and any $|\lambda + i - z| = r$, we have

$$z \in \rho(A + iP_n) \quad \text{with} \quad \|(A + iP_n - z)^{-1}\| \le \frac{1}{c_1}.$$

Let $u \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\|u\| = 1$ then, using the identity

$$\begin{aligned}(A + iP_n - z)^{-1} &= (A + iE - z)^{-1} \\ &\quad + (A + iE - z)^{-1}(iE - iP_n)(A + iP_n - z)^{-1}\end{aligned}$$

and recalling that $m = \min\sigma(A)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\|(A - m + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}(A + iP_n - z)^{-1}u\| \\ &\quad \le \|(A - m + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}(A + iE - z)^{-1}u\| \\ &\qquad + \|(A - m + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}(A + iE - z)^{-1}(iE - iP_n)(A + iP_n - z)^{-1}u\| \\ &\quad \le \|(A - m + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}(A + iE - z)^{-1}\| \\ &\qquad + 2\|(A - m + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}(A + iE - z)^{-1}\|\|(A + iP_n - z)^{-1}u\| \\ &\quad \le \max_{|\lambda+i-z|=r} \left\{ \frac{(2 + c_1)\|(A - m + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}(A + iE - z)^{-1}\|}{c_1} \right\} =: M.\end{aligned}$$

Now let $u \in \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$ with $\|u\| = 1$. The above estimate gives

$$\begin{aligned}\|(A+iE-z)^{-1}u - (A+iP_n-z)^{-1}u\|_{\mathfrak{a}} &= \|(A+iP_n-z)^{-1}(P_n-E)(A+iE-z)^{-1}u\|_{\mathfrak{a}} \\ &= \frac{\|(A-m+1)^{\frac{1}{2}}(A+iP_n-z)^{-1}(P_n-I)u\|}{r} \\ &\leq \frac{M\|(I-P_n)E\|}{r} \\ &= \frac{M\delta(\mathcal{L}(\Delta),\mathcal{L}_n)}{r}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Set

$$u_n := -\frac{1}{2i\pi}\int_{|\lambda+i-z|=r}(A+iP_n-\zeta)^{-1}u\ d\zeta,$$

then $u_n \in \mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\})$. Using estimate (4.7),

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\frac{u}{\|u\|_{\mathfrak{a}}} - \frac{u_n}{\|u\|_{\mathfrak{a}}}\right\|_{\mathfrak{a}} \\ &\quad= \frac{1}{2\pi\|u\|_{\mathfrak{a}}}\left\|\int_{|\lambda+i-z|=r}(A+iE-\zeta)^{-1}u - (A+iP_n-\zeta)^{-1}u\ d\zeta\right\|_{\mathfrak{a}} \\ &\quad\leq \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{|\lambda+i-z|=r}\left\|(A+iE-\zeta)^{-1}u - (A+iP_n-\zeta)^{-1}u\right\|_{\mathfrak{a}}\ |d\zeta| \\ &\quad= \mathcal{O}\big(\delta(\mathcal{L}(\Delta),\mathcal{L}_n)\big)\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\delta_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\}),\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\})\big) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_n).$$

Furthermore, using Lemma 4.4, $\dim\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\}) = \dim\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\}) = \kappa < \infty$ for all sufficiently large n, therefore the following formula holds

$$\delta_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\}),\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})\big) \leq \frac{\delta_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\}),\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\})\big)}{1-\delta_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\}),\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\})\big)};$$

see [17, Lemma 213]. □

It follows, from Theorem 4.5, that for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the operator $A+iP_n$ will have κ (repeated) eigenvalues enclosed by the circle $|\lambda+i-z| = r$. We denote these eigenvalues by $\mu_{n,1},\ldots,\mu_{n,\kappa}$.

Theorem 4.6. $\max_{1\leq j\leq\kappa}|\lambda+i-\mu_{n,j}| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_n^2)$.

Proof. Let $u_1,\ldots,u_\kappa$ be an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$. Let Q_n be the orthogonal projection from $\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{a}}$ onto $\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\})$ and set $u_{n,j} = Q_n u_j$ for each $1 \leq j \leq \kappa$. By Theorem 4.5,

$$\|u_j - u_{n,j}\|_{\mathfrak{a}} = \|(I-Q_n)u_j\|_{\mathfrak{a}} = \operatorname{dist}_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(u_j,\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\})\big) = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_n),$$

and we may assume that Q_n maps $\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$ one-to-one onto $\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\})$.

Consider the $\kappa\times\kappa$ matrices

$$[L_n]_{p,q} = \langle(A+iP_n)u_{n,q},u_{n,p}\rangle \quad\text{and}\quad [M_n]_{p,q} = \langle u_{n,q},u_{n,p}\rangle.$$

Evidently, M_n converges to the $\kappa\times\kappa$ identity matrix and $\sigma(L_nM_n^{-1})$ is precisely the set $\{\mu_{n,1},\ldots,\mu_{n,\kappa}\}$. We have

$$[L_n]_{p,q} = \mathfrak{a}(u_{n,q},u_{n,p}) + i\langle P_nu_{n,q},u_{n,p}\rangle.$$

Consider the first term on the right hand side,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{a}(u_{n,q},u_{n,p}) &= \mathfrak{a}((Q_n-I)u_q,u_p)+\mathfrak{a}((Q_n-I)u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p)\\ &\quad+\mathfrak{a}(u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p)+\mathfrak{a}(u_q,u_p)\\ &= \lambda\langle(Q_n-I)u_q,u_p\rangle+\mathfrak{a}((Q_n-I)u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p)\\ &\quad+\lambda\langle u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p\rangle+\lambda\delta_{pq}\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}|(\lambda-m+1)\langle u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p\rangle| &= |\mathfrak{a}(u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p)\\ &\qquad+(1-m)\langle u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p\rangle|\\ &= |\langle u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p\rangle_{\mathfrak{a}}|\\ &= |\langle(Q_n-I)u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p\rangle_{\mathfrak{a}}|\\ &\le \|(Q_n-I)u_q\|_{\mathfrak{a}}\|(Q_n-I)u_p\|_{\mathfrak{a}},\end{aligned}$$

hence $\mathfrak{a}(u_{n,q},u_{n,p})=\lambda\delta_{pq}+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_n^2)$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle P_nu_{n,q},u_{n,p}\rangle &= \langle P_n(Q_n-I)u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p\rangle+\langle(Q_n-I)u_q,(P_n-I)u_p\rangle\\ &\quad+\langle(Q_n-I)u_q,u_p\rangle+\langle(P_n-I)u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p\rangle\\ &\quad+\langle u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p\rangle+\langle(P_n-I)u_q,u_p\rangle+\delta_{pq}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}[M_n]_{p,q} &= \langle(Q_n-I)u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p\rangle+\langle(Q_n-I)u_q,u_p\rangle+\langle u_q,(Q_n-I)u_p\rangle\\ &\quad+\delta_{pq}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$i\langle P_nu_{n,q},u_{n,p}\rangle = i\delta_{pq}+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_n^2)\quad\text{and}\quad[M_n]_{p,q}=\delta_{pq}+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_n^2).$$

Then

$$[L_n]_{p,q}=(\lambda+i)\delta_{p,q}+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_n^2)\quad\text{and}\quad[M_n]^{-1}_{p,q}=\delta_{pq}+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_n^2),$$

and we deduce that $[L_nM_n^{-1}]_{p,q}=(\lambda+i)\delta_{p,q}+\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon_n^2)$. The result follows from the Gershgorin circle theorem. □

5. The Perturbation Method

The perturbation method, for locating $\sigma_{\mathrm{dis}}(A)$, was introduced in [20] where it was formulated for Schrödinger operators. A more general version was presented in [29] which required á priori knowledge about the location of gaps in the essential spectrum. In this section we present a new perturbation method which requires no á priori information and converges rapidly to $\sigma_{\mathrm{dis}}(A)$. In fact, our examples suggest that the method will actually capture the whole of $\sigma(A)$.

The idea is to perturb eigenvalues off the real line by adding a perturbation iP where P is a finite-rank orthogonal projection. The results from the previous sections allow us to perturb eigenvalues very precisely. The perturbed eigenvalues and their multiplicities may then be approximated with the Galerkin method without incurring spectral pollution; see [29, Theorem 2.5 & Theorem 2.9]. As above, (P_n) denotes a sequence of finite-rank orthogonal projections each with range $\mathcal{L}_n$. We shall assume that

$$\forall u\in\mathrm{Dom}(\mathfrak{a})\quad\exists u_n\in\mathcal{L}_n:\quad\|u-u_n\|_{\mathfrak{a}}\to 0. \tag{5.1}$$

This is the usual hypothesis for a sequence of trial spaces when using the Galerkin method. For sufficiently large n we have, by Proposition 4.2, that

$$\mathcal{U}_{a,b}^{0,1}\cap\sigma(A+iP_n)$$

will consist of eigenvalues in a small neighbourhood of $\Gamma^{0,1}_{a,b}$, and, by Theorem 4.6, eigenvalues within ε_n^2 neighbourhoods of the $\lambda_j + i$; recall that

$$\varepsilon_n = \delta(\mathcal{L}(\Delta), \mathcal{L}_n). \tag{5.2}$$

We stress that ε_n^2 is extremely small; indeed, if pollution does not occur and we use the Galerkin method to approximate the eigenvalue λ, then our approximation will be of the order ϵ_n^2 where

$$\epsilon_n := \delta_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mathcal{L}(\Delta), \mathcal{L}_n). \tag{5.3}$$

In this section we are concerned with the approximation of the eigenvalues of $A + iP_n$ using the Galerkin method. To this end, for our fixed $\lambda \in \{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_d\}$, let us fix an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda + i\}) = \dim \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\}) = \kappa \quad \forall n \geq N;$$

such an N is assured by Theorem 4.5.

Associated to the restriction of the form $\mathfrak{a}$ to the trial space $\mathcal{L}_k$ is a self-adjoint operator acting in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{L}_k$; denote this operator and corresponding spectral measure by A_k and E_k, respectively. The Galerkin eigenvalues of $A + iP_n$ with respect to the trial space $\mathcal{L}_k$ are denoted $\sigma(A + iP_n, \mathcal{L}_k)$ and are precisely the eigenvalues of

$$A_k + iP_kP_n : \mathcal{L}_k \to \mathcal{L}_k.$$

For our $\lambda \in \Delta$, we denote by $\mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda + i\})$ the spectral subspace associated to the operator $A_k + iP_kP_n : \mathcal{L}_k \to \mathcal{L}_k$ and those eigenvalues in a neighbourhood of $\lambda + i$. Then, for a fixed $n \geq N$, we have for all sufficiently large k

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda + i\}) = \dim \mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda + i\}) = \dim \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\}) = \kappa. \tag{5.4}$$

We now study the convergence properties of $\mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda + i\})$ and associated eigenvalues, where our main convergence results are expressed in terms of ε_k and ϵ_n from (5.2) and (5.3), respectively. We note that, using Theorem 4.5,

$$\delta_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\}), \mathcal{L}_k) \leq \delta_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\}), \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})) + \delta_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\}), \mathcal{L}_k) \leq c_0\varepsilon_n + \epsilon_k \tag{5.5}$$

where $c_0 > 0$ is independent of n.

Lemma 5.1. *There exists a constant $c_2 > 0$, independent of $n \geq N$, such that*

$$\max_{|\lambda+i-z|=r} \|(A_k + iP_kP_n - z)^{-1}\| \leq c_2 \quad \textit{for all sufficiently large } k.$$

Proof. We assume that the assertion is false. Then there exist sequences (n_p) and (γ_p) with $\gamma_p \to \infty$, such that, for each fixed p there is a subsequence k_q with

$$\max_{|\lambda+i-z|=r} \|(A_{k_q} + iP_{k_q}P_{n_p} - z)^{-1}\| > 2\gamma_p \quad \text{for all sufficiently large } q.$$

Let us fix a p. We may assume, without loss of generality, that

$$\max_{|\lambda+i-z|=r} \|(A_k + iP_kP_{n_p} - z)^{-1}\| > 2\gamma_p \quad \text{for all sufficiently large } k.$$

Let (z_k) be a sequence with $|\lambda + i - z_k| = r$ and

$$\|(A_k + iP_kP_{n_p} - z_k)^{-1}\| > 2\gamma_p \quad \text{for all sufficiently large } k.$$

The sequence z_k has a convergent subsequence, without loss of generality, we assume that $z_k \to z$, where $|\lambda + i - z| = r$. For all sufficiently large k, there exists a normalised vector u_k with

$$\|(A_k + iP_kP_{n_p} - z_k)u_k\| < \frac{1}{2\gamma_p}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\|(A_k + iP_kP_{n_p} - z)u_k\| &\leq \|(A_k + iP_kP_{n_p} - z_k)u_k\| + |z_k - z| \\ &< \frac{1}{2\gamma_p} + |z_k - z|,\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\max_{\substack{v\in\mathcal{L}_k \\ \|v\|=1}} |\mathfrak{a}(u_k, v) + i\langle P_{n_p}u_k, v\rangle - z\langle u_k, v\rangle| < \frac{1}{\gamma_p} \quad \text{for all sufficiently large } k.$$

The sequence $P_{n_p}u_k$ has a convergent subsequence. We assume, without loss of generality, that $iP_{n_p}u_k \to w$. Therefore

$$\max_{\substack{v\in\mathcal{L}_k \\ \|v\|=1}} |\mathfrak{a}(u_k, v) + \langle w, v\rangle - z\langle u_k, v\rangle| < \frac{1}{\gamma_p} + \alpha_k \quad \text{for some} \quad 0 \leq \alpha_k \to 0.$$

Denote by $\hat{P}_k$ the orthogonal projection from $\mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{a}$ onto $\mathcal{L}_k$. Let $x = -(A - z)^{-1}w$ and set $x_k = \hat{P}_k x$, then for any $v \in \mathcal{L}_k$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{a}(x_k, v) - z\langle x_k, v\rangle &= \mathfrak{a}(x, v) - z\langle x, v\rangle - \mathfrak{a}((I - \hat{P}_k)x, v) + z\langle (I - \hat{P}_k)x, v\rangle \\ &= \mathfrak{a}(x, v) - z\langle x, v\rangle + (z - m + 1)\langle (I - \hat{P}_k)x, v\rangle \\ &= -\langle w, v\rangle + (z - m + 1)\langle (I - \hat{P}_k)x, v\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

We deduce that

$$\max_{\substack{v\in\mathcal{L}_k \\ \|v\|=1}} |\mathfrak{a}(u_k - x_k, v) - z\langle u_k - x_k, v\rangle| < \frac{1}{\gamma_p} + \beta_k \quad \text{for some} \quad 0 \leq \beta_k \to 0,$$

hence

$$\|u_k - x_k\| < \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_p} + \beta_k\right) \Big/ \operatorname{Im} z \leq \frac{1}{\gamma_p(1 - r)} + \frac{\beta_k}{(1 - r)}$$

and therefore

$$\|x\| \leftarrow \|x_k\| > 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_p(1 - r)} - \frac{\beta_k}{(1 - r)} \to 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_p(1 - r)}. \tag{5.6}$$

Let $y = (A + iP_{n_p} - z)x = -w - iP_{n_p}(A - z)^{-1}w$. Since $iP_{n_p}u_k \to w$ implies that $w \in \mathcal{L}_{n_p} \subset \mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{a}$, we deduce that $y \in \mathcal{H}_\mathfrak{a}$ and we set $y_k = \hat{P}_k y$. Using (5.6) and with $c_1 > 0$ as in the proof of Theorem 4.5,

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathfrak{a}(x_k, y_k) + i\langle P_{n_p}x_k, y_k\rangle - z\langle x_k, y_k\rangle| &\to \|(A + iP_{n_p} - z)x\|^2 \\ &\geq c_1^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_p(1 - r)}\right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, using the estimates above we have

$$\begin{aligned}&|\mathfrak{a}(x_k, y_k) + i\langle P_{n_p}x_k, y_k\rangle - z\langle x_k, y_k\rangle| \\ &\qquad = |\mathfrak{a}(x_k - u_k, y_k) + i\langle P_{n_p}(x_k - u_k), y_k\rangle - z\langle x_k - u_k, y_k\rangle \\ &\qquad\quad + \mathfrak{a}(u_k, y_k) + i\langle P_{n_p}u_k, y_k\rangle - z\langle u_k, y_k\rangle| \\ &\qquad \leq |\mathfrak{a}(x_k - u_k, y_k) - z\langle x_k - u_k, y_k\rangle| + |\langle P_{n_p}(x_k - u_k), y_k\rangle| \\ &\qquad\quad + |\mathfrak{a}(u_k, y_k) + i\langle P_{n_p}u_k, y_k\rangle - z\langle u_k, y_k\rangle| \\ &\qquad < \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_p} + \beta_k\right)\|y_k\| + \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_p(1 - r)} + \frac{\beta_k}{(1 - r)}\right)\|y_k\| + \frac{1}{\gamma_p}\|y_k\|.\end{aligned}$$

Since $y = (A + iP_{n_p} - z)x = -w - iP_{n_p}(A - z)^{-1}w$ where $\|w\| \leq 1$,

$$\|y_k\| \to \|y\| = \| - w - iP_{n_p}(A - z)^{-1}w\| \leq \|w\| + \|iP_{n_p}(A - z)^{-1}w\| \leq 1 + \frac{1}{1 - r},$$

hence

$$\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_p}+\beta_k\right)\|y_k\|+\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_p(1-r)}+\frac{\beta_k}{1-r}\right)\|y_k\|+\frac{1}{\gamma_p}\|y_k\| \\ \to\left(\frac{2}{\gamma_p}+\frac{1}{\gamma_p(1-r)}\right)\|y\| \\ \leq\left(\frac{2}{\gamma_p}+\frac{1}{\gamma_p(1-r)}\right)\left(1+\frac{1}{1-r}\right).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_1^2\left(1-\frac{1}{\gamma_p(1-r)}\right)^2 &\leq \|(A+iP_{n_p}-z)x\|^2 \\ &\leftarrow |\mathfrak{a}(x_k,y_k)+i\langle P_{n_p}x_k,y_k\rangle - z\langle x_k,y_k\rangle| \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\gamma_p}+\beta_k\right)\|y_k\|+\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_p(1-r)}+\frac{\beta_k}{1-r}\right)\|y_k\| \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{\gamma_p}\|y_k\| \\ &\to\left(\frac{2}{\gamma_p}+\frac{1}{\gamma_p(1-r)}\right)\|y\| \\ &\leq\left(\frac{2}{\gamma_p}+\frac{1}{\gamma_p(1-r)}\right)\left(1+\frac{1}{1-r}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Evidently, the left hand side is larger than the right hand side for all sufficiently large p. The result follows from the contradiction. □

Theorem 5.2. *There exist constants $c_3, c_4 > 0$, both independent of $n \geq N$, such that*

$$\hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\}),\mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda+i\})\big) \leq c_3\delta_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\}),\mathcal{L}_k) \tag{5.7}$$

and

$$\hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda+i\}),\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})\big) \leq c_4(\varepsilon_n+\epsilon_k) \tag{5.8}$$

for all sufficiently large k.

Proof. First we prove (5.7). Let $u \in \mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\})$ with $\|u\|=1$. For $|\lambda+i-z|=r$, we denote

$$A_k(z) = A_k + iP_kP_n - z \quad \text{and} \quad x(z) = (A+iP_n-z)^{-1}u \in \mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\}).$$

Then, with $c_1 > 0$ as in the proof of Theorem 4.5, we have $\|x(z)\| \leq c_1^{-1}$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|x(z)\|_{\mathfrak{a}}^2 &= \mathfrak{a}[x(z)] - (m-1)\|x(z)\|^2 \\ &= \langle Ax(z),x(z)\rangle - (m-1)\|x(z)\|^2 \\ &= \langle A(A+iP_n-z)^{-1}u,x(z)\rangle - (m-1)\|x(z)\|^2 \\ &= \langle u,x(z)\rangle - \langle (iP_n-z)x(z),x(z)\rangle - (m-1)\|x(z)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|x(z)\| + (2+m+|z|)\|x(z)\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c_1}+\frac{2+m+|z|}{c_1^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\|(A+iP_n-z)^{-1}u\|_{\mathfrak{a}} = \|x(z)\|_{\mathfrak{a}} \leq K_1 \tag{5.9}$$

for constant $K_1 > 0$ which is independent of $n \geq N$ and $|\lambda + i - z| = r$. Let $v \in \mathcal{L}_k$ with $\|v\| = 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\langle A_k(z)\hat{P}_k x(z) - u, v\rangle &= \mathfrak{a}(\hat{P}_k x(z), v) + i\langle P_n \hat{P}_k x(z), v\rangle - z\langle \hat{P}_k x(z), v\rangle - \langle u, v\rangle \\ &= i\langle P_n(\hat{P}_k - I)x(z), v\rangle - (z - m + 1)\langle (\hat{P}_k - I)x(z), v\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\|A_k(z)\hat{P}_k x(z) - P_k u\| \leq \big(1 + |(z - m + 1)|\big)\|(\hat{P}_k - I)x(z)\|$$

then, using Lemma 5.1,

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - \hat{P}_k x(z)\| &\leq c_2\|A_k(z)\hat{P}_k x(z) - P_k u\| \\ &\leq c_2\big(1 + |(z - m + 1)|\big)\|(\hat{P}_k - I)x(z)\|\end{aligned}$$

where c_2 is independent of $n \geq N$ and $|\lambda + i - z| = r$. Furthermore,

$$\|A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - x(z)\|_{\mathfrak{a}} \leq \|A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - \hat{P}_k x(z)\|_{\mathfrak{a}} + \|(\hat{P}_k - I)x(z)\|_{\mathfrak{a}}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}&\|A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - \hat{P}_k x(z)\|_{\mathfrak{a}}^2 \\ &\quad= (\mathfrak{a} - m)[A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - \hat{P}_k x(z)] + \|A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - \hat{P}_k x(z)\|^2 \\ &\quad= \langle P_k u - A_k(z)\hat{P}_k x(z), A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - \hat{P}_k x(z)\rangle \\ &\qquad - \langle (iP_k P_n - z)(A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - \hat{P}_k x(z)), A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - \hat{P}_k x(z)\rangle \\ &\qquad + (1 - m)\|A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - \hat{P}_k x(z)\|^2 \\ &\quad\leq \|P_k u - A_k(z)\hat{P}_k x(z)\|\|A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - \hat{P}_k x(z)\| \\ &\qquad + \|iP_k P_n - z\|\|A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - \hat{P}_k x(z)\|^2 \\ &\qquad + |1 - m|\|A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - \hat{P}_k x(z)\|^2 \\ &\quad\leq c_2\big(1 + |(z - m + 1)|\big)^2\|(\hat{P}_k - I)x(z)\|^2 \\ &\qquad + \big(1 + |z|\big)c_2^2\big(1 + |(z - m + 1)|\big)^2\|(\hat{P}_k - I)x(z)\|^2 \\ &\qquad + |1 - m|c_2^2\big(1 + |(z - m + 1)|\big)^2\|(\hat{P}_k - I)x(z)\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_k(z)^{-1}P_k u - (A + iP_n - z)^{-1}u\|_{\mathfrak{a}} &\leq K_2\|(\hat{P}_k - I)x(z)\|_{\mathfrak{a}} \\ &\leq K_2\|x(z)\|_{\mathfrak{a}}\delta_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda + i\}), \mathcal{L}_k) \\ &\leq K_1 K_2 \delta_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda + i\}), \mathcal{L}_k) \qquad (5.10)\end{aligned}$$

for constant $K_2 > 0$ which is independent of $n \geq N$ and $|\lambda + i - z| = r$. Set

$$u_k := -\frac{1}{2i\pi}\int_{|\lambda+i-z|=r} A_k(\zeta)^{-1}P_k u \; d\zeta,$$

then $u_k \in \mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda + i\})$ and

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\frac{u}{\|u\|_{\mathfrak{a}}} - \frac{u_k}{\|u\|_{\mathfrak{a}}}\right\|_{\mathfrak{a}} = \\ &\qquad\frac{1}{2\pi\|u\|_{\mathfrak{a}}}\left\|\int_{|\lambda+i-z|=r} A_k(\zeta)^{-1}P_k u - (A + iP_n - \zeta)^{-1}u \; d\zeta\right\|_{\mathfrak{a}} \\ &\qquad\leq \frac{1}{2\pi\|u\|_{\mathfrak{a}}}\int_{|\lambda+i-z|=r}\big\|A_k(\zeta)^{-1}P_k u - (A + iP_n - \zeta)^{-1}u\big\|_{\mathfrak{a}}\;|d\zeta|.\end{aligned}$$

Combining this estimate with (5.10), we deduce that for some constant $K_3 > 0$ which is independent of $n \geq N$ and $|\lambda + i - z| = r$, we have

$$\delta_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\}), \mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda_j+i\})) \leq K_3 \delta_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\}), \mathcal{L}_k).$$

Then, by virtue of (5.4), the following formula holds for all sufficiently large k,

$$\delta_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda+i\}), \mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\})\big) \leq \frac{\delta_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\}), \mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda+i\})\big)}{1 - \delta_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\}), \mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda+i\})\big)}.$$

The assertion (5.7) is proved. Now using (5.7), (5.5) and Theorem 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda+i\}), \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})\big) &\leq \delta_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda+i\}), \mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\})\big) \\
&\quad + \delta_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\}), \mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})\big) \\
&\leq c_3 \delta_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{M}_n(\{\lambda+i\}), \mathcal{L}_k\big) + c_0 \varepsilon_n \\
&\leq c_0(c_3+1)\varepsilon_n + c_3 \epsilon_k.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Let $\mu_{n,k,1}, \ldots, \mu_{n,k,\kappa}$ be the repeated eigenvalues of $A_k + iP_kP_n$ which are associated to the subspace $\mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda+i\})$.

Theorem 5.3. *There exists a constant $c_5 > 0$, independent of $n \geq N$, such that*

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq \kappa} |\mu_{n,k,j} - \lambda - i| \leq c_5(\varepsilon_n + \epsilon_k)^2$$

for all sufficiently large k.

Proof. Let $u_1, \ldots, u_\kappa$ be an orthonormal basis for $\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\})$. Let R_k be the orthogonal projection from $\mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{a}}$ onto $\mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda+i\})$ and set $u_{j,k} = R_k u_j$. Using Theorem 5.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_j - u_{j,k}\|_{\mathfrak{a}} &= \|(I - R_k)u_j\|_{\mathfrak{a}} \\
&= \operatorname{dist}_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(u_j, \mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda+i\})\big) \\
&\leq \|u_j\|_{\mathfrak{a}} \hat{\delta}_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\}), \mathcal{M}_{n,k}(\{\lambda+i\})\big) \\
&\leq \|u_j\|_{\mathfrak{a}} c_4(\varepsilon_n + \epsilon_k) \\
&\leq K_4(\varepsilon_n + \epsilon_k)
\end{aligned}$$

for constant $K_4 > 0$ which is independent of $n \geq N$. Consider the matrices

$$[L_{n,k}]_{p,q} = \mathfrak{a}(u_{q,k}, u_{p,k}) + i\langle P_n u_{q,k}, u_{p,k}\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad [M_{n,k}]_{p,q} = \langle u_{q,k}, u_{p,k}\rangle.$$

Evidently, $\sigma(L_{n,k}M_{n,k}^{-1})$ is precisely the set $\{\mu_{n,k,1}, \ldots, \mu_{n,k,\kappa}\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{a}(u_{q,k}, u_{p,k}) &= \mathfrak{a}((R_k - I)u_q, u_p) + \mathfrak{a}((R_k - I)u_q, (R_k - I)u_p) \\
&\quad + \mathfrak{a}(u_q, (R_k - I)u_p) + \mathfrak{a}(u_q, u_p) \\
&= \lambda\langle (R_k - I)u_q, u_p\rangle + \mathfrak{a}((R_k - I)u_q, (R_k - I)u_p) \\
&\quad + \lambda\langle u_q, (R_k - I)u_p\rangle + \lambda\delta_{qp}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
|(\lambda - m + 1)\langle u_q, (R_k - I)u_p\rangle| &= |\langle u_q, (R_k - I)u_p\rangle_{\mathfrak{a}}| \\
&= |\langle (R_k - I)u_q, (R_k - I)u_p\rangle_{\mathfrak{a}}| \\
&\leq \|(R_k - I)u_q\|_{\mathfrak{a}} \|(R_k - I)u_p\|_{\mathfrak{a}},
\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$|\mathfrak{a}(u_{q,k}, u_{p,k}) - \lambda\delta_{qp}| \leq K_5(\varepsilon_n + \epsilon_k)^2$$

for constant $K_5 > 0$ which is independent of $n \geq N$. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle P_n u_{q,k}, u_{p,k}\rangle = \langle P_n(R_k - I)u_q, (R_k - I)u_p\rangle + \langle (R_k - I)u_q, (P_n - I)u_p\rangle \\ + \langle (R_k - I)u_q, u_p\rangle + \langle (P_n - I)u_q, (R_k - I)u_p\rangle \\ + \langle u_q, (R_k - I)u_p\rangle + \langle (P_n - I)u_q, u_p\rangle + \langle u_q, u_p\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$|i\langle P_n u_{q,k}, u_{p,k}\rangle - i\delta_{qp}| \leq K_6(\varepsilon_n + \epsilon_k)^2,$$

for constant $K_6 > 0$ which is independent of $n \geq N$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}[M_{n,k}]_{p,q} = \langle (R_k - I)u_q, (R_k - I)u_p\rangle + \langle (R_k - I)u_q, u_p\rangle + \langle u_q, (R_k - I)u_p\rangle \\ + \delta_{pq},\end{aligned}$$

hence for constants $K_7, K_8 > 0$ both independent of $n \geq N$, we have

$$|[M_{n,k}]_{pq} - \delta_{pq}| \leq K_7(\varepsilon_n + \epsilon_k)^2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad |[M_{n,k}]^{-1}_{pq} - \delta_{pq}| \leq K_8(\varepsilon_n + \epsilon_k)^2.$$

Then

$$|[L_{n,k}M^{-1}_{n,k}]_{p,q} - (\lambda + i)\delta_{p,q}| \leq K_9(\varepsilon_n + \epsilon_k)^2$$

for constant $K_9 > 0$ which is independent of $n \geq N$. The result follows from the Gershgorin circle theorem. □

Remark 5.4. We note that, for any orthogonal projection P, all non-real eigenvalues of $A + iP$ can provide information about $\sigma(A)$. Indeed, whenever $(A + iP - z)u = 0$ with $u \neq 0$, we have

$$(A - \operatorname{Re} z)u = i\operatorname{Im} zu - iPu, \quad \langle Au, u\rangle = \operatorname{Re} z\|u\|^2, \quad \|Pu\|^2 = \operatorname{Im} z\|u\|^2 \quad (5.11)$$

and using the first and third terms from (5.11) yields

$$\|(A - \operatorname{Re} z)u\|^2 = (\operatorname{Im} z)^2\|u\|^2 + (1 - 2\operatorname{Im} z)\|Pu\|^2 = \operatorname{Im} z(1 - \operatorname{Im} z)\|u\|^2, \quad (5.12)$$

then

$$\left[\operatorname{Re} z - \sqrt{\operatorname{Im} z(1 - \operatorname{Im} z)}, \operatorname{Re} z + \sqrt{\operatorname{Im} z(1 - \operatorname{Im} z)}\right] \cap \sigma(A) \neq \varnothing.$$

Further, suppose that $(a', b') \cap \sigma(A) = \lambda$ and $a' < \operatorname{Re} z < b'$. Then, using [16, Lemma 1 & 2] with the second term in (5.11) and the equality (5.12), we obtain the enclosure

$$\lambda \in \left(\operatorname{Re} z - \frac{\operatorname{Im} z(1 - \operatorname{Im} z)}{b' - \operatorname{Re} z}, \operatorname{Re} z + \frac{\operatorname{Im} z(1 - \operatorname{Im} z)}{\operatorname{Re} z - a'}\right).$$

Let us now verify our main results with a illustrative example.

Example 5.5. With $\mathcal{H} = \left[L^2\big((0,1)\big)\right]^2$ we consider the following block-operator matrix

$$A_0 = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} & -\frac{d}{dx} \\ \frac{d}{dx} & 2I \end{pmatrix}, \ \operatorname{Dom}(A_0) = H^2\big((0,1)\big) \cap H^1_0\big((0,1)\big) \times H^1\big((0,1)\big).$$

A_0 is essentially self-adjoint with closure A. We have $\sigma_{\text{ess}}(A) = \{1\}$ (see for example [31, Example 2.4.11]) while $\sigma_{\text{dis}}(A)$ consists of the simple eigenvalue 2 with eigenvector $(0,1)^T$, and the two sequences of simple eigenvalues

$$\lambda^{\pm}_k := \frac{2 + k^2\pi^2 \pm \sqrt{(k^2\pi^2 + 2)^2 - 4k^2\pi^2}}{2}.$$

The sequence λ^-_k lies below, and accumulates at, the essential spectrum. The sequence λ^+_k lies above the eigenvalue 2 and accumulates at ∞.

Let $\mathcal{L}^0_h$ be the FEM space of piecewise linear functions on $[0,1]$ with a uniform mesh of size h and which satisfy homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. Let $\mathcal{L}_h$ be the space without boundary conditions. First we apply the Galerkin method

directly to A with trial spaces $L_h = \mathcal{L}_h^0 \oplus \mathcal{L}_h$. We find that spectral pollution occurs in the interval $(1,2) \subset \rho(A)$ which obscures the approximation of the genuine eigenvalue 2; see the left-hand side of Figure 6. Let $P_{1/16}$ be the orthogonal



FIGURE 6. On the left-hand side, Galerkin method approximation for $\sigma(A)$ from Example 5.5, spectral pollution in the interval $(1,2)$ obscures the approximation of the genuine eigenvalue 2. On the right-hand side, the Galerkin method approximation for $\sigma(A + iP_{1/16})$ from Example 5.5, the curves f and g, which together form $\Gamma^{0,1}_{1,\lambda_1^+}$. The region $\mathcal{U}^{0,1}_{1,\lambda_1^+}$ consists of complex numbers which lie to the right of f and to the left of g.

projection onto the trial space $L_{1/16}$. Since

$$(1,\lambda_1^+) \cap \sigma(A) = \{2\} \in \sigma_{\mathrm{dis}}(A)$$

and $(0,1)^T \in L_h$ for all $h \in (0,1]$, the hypothesis of Lemma 4.3 is satisfied, hence

$$\sigma(A + iP_{1/16}) \cap \mathcal{U}^{0,1}_{1,\lambda_1^+} = \{2+i\} \in \sigma(A + iP_{1/16}).$$

Furthermore, by [29, Theorem 2.5], we can approximate the eigenvalue $\{2+i\}$, with the Galerkin method, without incurring any spectral pollution, i.e.,

$$\left(\lim_{h\to 0} \sigma(A + iP_{1/16}, L_h) \right) \cap \left(\mathcal{U}^{0,1}_{1,\lambda_1^+} \backslash \mathbb{R} \right) = \{2+i\}.$$

The right-hand side of Figure 6 shows the Galerkin method approximation of $\sigma(A + iP_{1/16})$ with the trial space $L_{1/1024}$. We see that $2+i \in \sigma(A + iP_{1/16}, L_{1/1024})$ and the only elements from

$$\left(\sigma(A + iP_{1/16}, L_{1/2048}) \cap \mathcal{U}^{0,1}_{1,\lambda_1^+} \right) \backslash \{2+i\}$$

are very close to the real line which is where spectral pollution is still permitted. The perturbation method has demonstrated that the Galerkin eigenvalues in the interval $(1,2)$ are all spurious. Furthermore, the genuine eigenvalue 2 is approximated by the perturbation method without being obscured by pollution.

Next we approximate the eigenvalue λ_1^+. Applying the Galerkin method directly to A we do not incur spectral pollution near λ_1^+ and consequently we have the standard superconvergence result:

$$\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda_1^+, \sigma(A, L_h)\big) = \mathcal{O}(\delta_{\mathfrak{a}}(\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda_1^+\}), \mathcal{L}_h)^2) = \mathcal{O}(h^2). \tag{5.13}$$

By Theorem 4.6 we have

$$\mathrm{dist}\big(\lambda_1^+ + i, \sigma(A + iP_h)\big) = \mathcal{O}(\delta(\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda_1^+\}), \mathcal{L}_h)^2) = \mathcal{O}(h^4). \tag{5.14}$$

The second column in Table 1 shows the distance of λ_1^+ to $\sigma(A, L_h)$, the third column shows the distance of $\lambda_1^+ + i$ to a Galerkin approximation (with very refined



FIGURE 7. On the left-hand side, approximation of λ_1^+ with $\sigma(A, L_h)$ and with an approximation of $\sigma(A + iP_h)$. The gradients blue and red lines are approximately 2 and 4, respectively. On the right-hand side, approximation of $\lambda_1^+ + i$ and λ_1^+ using the perturbation and Galerkin methods, respectively

mesh) of the eigenvalue of $A + iP_h$ which is close to $\lambda_1^+ + i$. The left-hand side of Figure 7 displays a loglog plot of the data in Table 1, and verifies both (5.13) and (5.14).

h	$\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda_1^+, \sigma(A, L_h)\big)$	$\operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda_1^+ + i, \sigma(A + iP_h, L_{h\times 2^{-7}})\big)$
1/2	1.861045647858232	0.014440864705963
1/4	0.458746253205135	0.000609676693732
1/8	0.113442149493080	0.000034835584324
1/16	0.028273751580725	0.000002688221958

TABLE 1. Approximation of λ_1^+ from $\sigma(A, L_h)$ and from an approximation of $\sigma(A + iP_h)$.

We now compare the approximation of λ_1^+ by applying the Galerkin method directly to A and to $A + iP_h$. The results are displayed on the right-hand side of Figure 7; we see that the approximation and convergence achieved by the perturbation method are essentially the same as those achieved by the Galerkin method. It is clear and consistent with Theorem 5.3 that we need not be concerned with locking-in poor accuracy with a relatively low dimensional projection P_h. In fact, it is quite remarkable that the approximation with $\sigma(A+iP_{1/32}, L_{1/32\times 2^7})$ is essentially the same as $\sigma(A, L_{1/32\times 2^7})$.

6. FURTHER EXAMPLES

Example 6.1. With $\mathcal{H} = \big[L^2((0,1), \rho_0 dx)\big]^3$ we consider the magnetohydrodynamics operator

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{d}{dx}(v_a^2 + v_s^2)\frac{d}{dx} + k^2 v_a^2 & -i(\frac{d}{dx}(v_a^2 + v_s^2) - 1)k_\perp & -i(\frac{d}{dx}v_s^2 - 1)k_\parallel \\ -ik_\perp((v_a^2 + v_s^2)\frac{d}{dx} + 1) & k^2 v_a^2 + k_\perp^2 v_s^2 & k_\perp k_\parallel v_s^2 \\ -ik_\parallel(v_s^2\frac{d}{dx} + 1) & k_\perp k_\parallel v_s^2 & k_\parallel^2 v_s^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

With $\rho_0 = k_\perp = k_\parallel = g = 1$, $v_a(x) = \sqrt{7/8 - x/2}$ and $v_s(x) = \sqrt{1/8 + x/2}$, we have

$$\sigma_{\text{ess}}(A) = [7/64, 1/4] \cup [3/8, 7/8].$$

The discrete spectrum contains a sequence of simple eigenvalues which accumilate only at ∞. These eigenvalues are above, and not close to, the essential spectrum. They are approximated by the Galerkin method, with trial spaces $L_h = \mathcal{L}_h^0 \oplus \mathcal{L}_h \oplus \mathcal{L}_h$, without incurring spectral pollution. It was shown, using the second order relative spectrum, that there is also an eigenvalue $\lambda_1 \approx 0.279$ in the gap in the essential spectrum; see [27, Example 2.7]. The top row of Figure 8 shows many Galerkin eigenvalues in the gap in the essential spectrum and many more just above the essential spectrum; we should be suspicious of spectral pollution in these regions. We define

$$\tau(A + iP_{h_0}, L_h) := \left\{ \operatorname{Re} z + (1 - \operatorname{Im} z)i : z \in \sigma(A + iP_{h_0}, L_h) \right\}$$

and we are therefore interested in those elements from $\tau(A + iP_{h_0}, L_h)$ which are close to the real line, i.e., we would prefer our approximate eigenvalues to converge to $\sigma(A)$ rather than $\sigma(A) + i$. The second row of Figure 8 shows $\tau(A + iP_{1/64}, L_{1/1024})$, the two bands of essential spectrum are clearly approximated along with an approximation of λ_1 in the gap, and a second eigenvalue above the essential spectrum. The perturbation method has approximated the essential spectrum, identified the spectral pollution, and approximated two eigenvalues which were obscured by the spectral pollution.



FIGURE 8. On the top row, we see the Galerkin method approximation for $\sigma(A)$ from Example 6.1. There are many Galerkin eigenvalues in the gap in the essential spectrum and many more just above the essential spectrum; in these regions we should be suspicious of spectral pollution. The second row shows the perturbation method approximation for $\sigma(A)$ from Example 6.1; the essential spectrum is approximated, as are two eigenvalues, one in the gap and one just above the essential spectrum. The perturbation method has identified the spectral pollution in the gap and above the essential spectrum.

Example 6.2. With $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R})$ we consider the Schrödinger operator

$$Au = -u'' + \left(\cos x - e^{-x^2}\right)u.$$

The essential spectrum of A has a band structure. The first three intervals of essential spectrum are approximately

$$[-0.37849, -0.34767], \quad [0.5948, 0.918058] \quad \text{and} \quad [1.29317, 2.28516].$$

The second order relative spectrum has been applied to this operator, see [6], where the following approximate eigenvalues were identified

$$\lambda_1 \approx -0.40961, \quad \lambda_2 \approx 0.37763, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_3 \approx 1.18216.$$

We note that λ_1 is below the essential spectrum, λ_2 is in the first gap in the essential spectrum, and λ_3 is in the second gap. We apply the perturbation method with the trial spaces $\mathcal{L}_{(X,Y)}$ which is a Y-dimensional space of piecewise linear trial functions on the the interval $[-X, X]$ which vanish at the boundary, and $P_{(X,Y)}$ is the orthogonal projection onto $\mathcal{L}_{(X,Y)}$. The left-hand side of Figure 9 shows the perturbation method has clearly identified the first two bands of essential spectrum and the eigenvalues λ_1 below the essential spectrum, λ_2 in the first gap, and λ_3 in the second gap.



FIGURE 9. The left-hand side shows the perturbation method approximation approximation for $\sigma(A)$ from Example 6.2. The first two bands of essential spectrum are approximated, as are the eigenvalues λ_1, λ_2 and λ_3. The right-hand side shows the perturbation method approximation approximation for $\sigma(A)$ from Example 6.3. The first two bands of essential spectrum are approximated, as are the first three eigenvalues in the first gap in the essential spectrum.

Example 6.3. With $\mathcal{H} = L^2\big((0,\infty)\big)$ we consider the Schrödinger operator

$$Au = -u'' + \left(\sin x - \frac{40}{1+x^2}\right)u, \quad u(0) = 0.$$

This example has been also been considered in [22]. The first three bands of essential spectrum are the same as in the previous example. However, this time there are infinitely many eigenvalues in the gaps which accumulate at the lower end point of the bands with their spacing becoming exponentially small; see [24]. We apply the perturbation method with the trial spaces $\mathcal{L}_{(X,Y)}$ which is a Y-dimensional space of piecewise linear trial functions on the interval $[0, X]$ which vanish at the boundary. The operator $P_{(X,Y)}$ is the orthogonal projection onto trial space $\mathcal{L}_{(X,Y)}$. The right-hand side of Figure 9 shows that the perturbation method has approximated three eigenvalues in the first gap of the essential spectrum.

We should stress the ease with which the above calculations are conducted. The perturbation method does not require trial spaces from the operator domain, thus we have been able to use the FEM spaces of piecewise linear trial functions. The quadratic methods cannot be applied with these trial spaces. Our final example is outside much of the theory so far developed for the perturbation method, this is because the operator concerned is indefinite. However, the numerical results suggest that the perturbation method can be extended to the indefinite case. The second order relative spectra has been applied to this example and the code made available online; see [5] and [1], respectively. We use this code to apply the Galerkin method, the perturbation method, the second order relative spectrum, the Davies & Plum method and Zimmermann & Mertins method.

Example 6.4. With $\mathcal{H} = \big[L^2\big((0,\infty)\big)\big]^2$ we consider the Dirac operator

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} I - \frac{1}{2x} & -\frac{d}{dx} - \frac{1}{x} \\ \\ \frac{d}{dx} - \frac{1}{x} & -I - \frac{1}{2x} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have $\sigma_{\rm ess}(A) = (-\infty,-1] \cup [1,\infty)$ and the interval $(-1,1)$ contains the eigenvalues

$$\sigma_{\rm dis}(A) = \left(1 + \frac{1}{4(j-1+\sqrt{3/4})^2}\right)^{-1/2} \qquad j = 1,2,\ldots.$$

We use trial spaces generated by Hermite functions of odd order; see [5] for further details. There is no spectral pollution incurred by the Galerkin method in this example, therefore we can also compare the perturbation method with the Galerkin method. The second order relative spectrum is known to converge to the discrete spectrum; see [4]. From this method we obtain a sequence of complex numbers with $z_n \to \lambda_1$, where n is the dimension of the trial space. The sequence of real parts $(\text{Re } z_n)$ we take as our approximation for λ_1. The Davies & Plum and Zimmermann & Mertins methods, which are equivalent, provide a sequence of intervals containing λ_1 we take the mid-point of these intervals, which we denote by w_n, to be our approximation of λ_1. Our numerical results suggest the following convergence rates

$$\begin{gathered} \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda_1 + i, \sigma(A + iP_{n/2}, P_n)\big) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-0.9}),\ \operatorname{dist}\big(\lambda_1, \sigma(A, P_n)\big) = \mathcal{O}(n^{-0.9}), \\ |\lambda_1 - z_n| = \mathcal{O}(n^{-0.2}),\ |\lambda_1 - \text{Re } z_n| = \mathcal{O}(n^{-0.7}) \text{ and } |\lambda_1 - w_n| = \mathcal{O}(n^{-0.2}). \end{gathered}$$

Again we see the performance of the perturbation method is essentially the same as the Galerkin method. We also note the relatively poor performance of the quadratic methods. The latter is not entirely surprising as the known convergence rates for quadratic methods are measured in terms of $\delta_A(\mathcal{L}(\{\lambda\}), \mathcal{L}_n)$, i.e., the distance of the eigenspace to the trial space with respect to the graph norm; see [8, Lemma 2] and [28, Section 6].

7. Conclusions and further research

Our theoretical results are, for the most part, focused on the perturbation and approximation of the discrete spectrum. However, the examples indicate that our new perturbation method also captures the essential spectrum. This should be further investigated. For the approximation of eigenvalues, the rapid convergence assured by theorems 4.6 & 5.3 mean that, in terms of accuracy and convergence, we can expect the perturbation method to significantly outperform the quadratic methods. The fact that the former may be applied with trial spaces from the form domain is another significant advantage. Recently a second pollution-free and non-quadratic technique has emerged; see [30]. Currently the latter has the disadvantage of requiring á priori information about gaps in the essential spectrum,

however, it does have the advantage of a self-adjoint algorithm. In terms of accuracy and convergence, there appears to be little separating these two non-quadratic techniques; see [30, examples 5.2 & 5.3]. Which technique is preferable will likely depend on the particular situation and availability of á priori information; this should be the subject of further study.

8. Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Marco Marletta and Eugene Shargorodsky for many useful discussions. Michael Strauss is also grateful for the support of the Wales Institute of Mathematical and Computational Sciences and the Leverhulme Trust grant: RPG-167.

References

[1] T. Betcke, N. J. Higham, V. Mehrmann, C. Schröder, and F. Tisseur, NLEVP: A Collection of Nonlinear Eigenvalue Problems, MIMS EPrint 2011.116, December 2011.
[2] D. Boffi, F. Brezzi, L. Gastaldi, On the problem of spurious eigenvalues in the approximation of linear elliptic problems in mixed form. Math. Comp., 69 (229) (2000) 121–140.
[3] D. Boffi, R. G. Duran, L. Gastaldi, A remark on spurious eigenvalues in a square. Appl. Math. Lett., 12 (3) (1999) 107–114.
[4] L. Boulton, Limiting set of second order spectrum. Math. Comp., 75 (2006) 1367–1382.
[5] L. Boulton, N. Boussaid, Non-variational computation of the eigenstates of Dirac operators with radially symmetric potentials. LMS J. Comput. Math. 13 (2010) 10–32.
[6] L. Boulton, M. Levitin, On Approximation of the Eigenvalues of Perturbed Periodic Schrödinger Operators. J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 40 (2007) 9319–9329.
[7] L. Boulton, M. Strauss, On the convergence of second-order spectra and multiplicity. Proc. R. Soc. A 467 (2011) 264–275.
[8] L. Boulton, M. Strauss, Eigenvalues enclosures and convergence for the linearized MHD operator. Bit Numer. Math. 52 (2012) 801–825.
[9] F. Chatelin, Spectral Approximation of Linear Operators. Academic Press (1983).
[10] M. Dauge, M. Suri, Numerical approximation of the spectra of non-compact operators arising in buckling problems. J. Numer. Math. 10 (2002) 193–219.
[11] E. B. Davies, Spectral enclosures and complex resonances for general self-adjoint operators. LMS J. Comput. Math. 1 (1998) 42–74.
[12] E. B. Davies, M. Plum, Spectral Pollution. IMA J. Numer. Anal. 24 (2004) 417–438.
[13] A. C. Hansen, On the approximation of spectra of linear operators on Hilbert spaces, J. Funct. Anal. 254 (8) (2008) 2092–2126.
[14] A. C. Hansen, Infinite dimensional numerical linear algebra; theory and applications, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A. 466 (2124) (2010) 3539–3559.
[15] A. C. Hansen, On the Solvability Complexity Index, the n-Pseudospectrum and Approximations of Spectra of Operators, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 24 (1) (2011) 81–124.
[16] T. Kato, On the upper and lower bounds of eigenvalues. J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. 4 (1949) 334–339.
[17] T. Kato, Perturbation theory for nullity, deficiency and other quantities of linear operators. J. Anallyse Math. 6 (1958) 261–322.
[18] T. Kato, Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators. Springer-Verlag (1995).
[19] M. Levitin, E. Shargorodsky, Spectral pollution and second order relative spectra for self-adjoint operators. IMA J. Numer. Anal. 24 (2004) 393–416.
[20] M. Marletta, Neumann-Dirichlet maps and analysis of spectral pollution for non-self-adjoint elliptic PDEs with real essential spectrum. IMA J. Numer. Analysis 30 (2010) 917–939.
[21] M. Marletta, S. Naboko, The finite section method for dissipative operators. Mathematika 60 (2) (2014) 415–443.
[22] M. Marletta, R. Scheichl, Eigenvalues in Spectral Gaps of Differential Operators. J. Spectral Theory 2 (3) (2012) 293–320.
[23] J. Rappaz, J. Sanchez Hubert, E. Sanchez Palencia & D. Vassiliev, On spectral pollution in the finite element approximation of thin elastic membrane shells. Numer. Math. 75 (1997) 473–500.
[24] K.M. Schmidt, Critical coupling constants and eigenvalue asymptotics of perturbed periodic Sturm-Liouville operators. Comm. Math. Phys. 211 (2000) 465–485.
[25] E. Shargorodsky, Geometry of higher order relative spectra and projection methods. J. Oper. Theory, 44 (2000) 43–62.

[26] E. Shargorodsky, On the limit behaviour of second order relative spectra of self-adjoint operators. J. Spectral Theory 3 (4) (2013) 535–552.
[27] M. Strauss, Quadratic Projection Methods for Approximating the Spectrum of Self-Adjoint Operators, IMA J. Numer. Anal. 31 (2011) 40–60.
[28] M. Strauss, The second order spectrum and optimal convergence. Math. Comp. 82 (2013) 2305–2325.
[29] M. Strauss, The Galerkin Method for Perturbed Self-Adjoint Operators and Applications. J. Spectral Theory 4 (1) (2014) 113–151.
[30] M. Strauss, A new approach to spectral approximation. J. Funct. Anal., 267 (8) (2014) 3084–3103.
[31] C. Tretter, Spectral Theory Of Block Operator Matrices And Applications. Imperial College Press (2007).
[32] S. Zimmermann, U. Mertins, Variational bounds to eigenvalues of self-adjoint eigenvalue problems with arbitrary spectrum. Z. Anal. Anwend. 14 (1995) 327–345.